

### REMARKS


The present response is to the Office Action mailed in the above-referenced case on May 04, 2005. Claims 1-12 are presented for examination. The Examiner has rejected the claims for statutory type double patenting under 35 U.S.C 101 as being identical to claims 1-12 of U.S. Patent No. 6,122,360.

In response to the Examiner's rejection, applicant herein cancels claims 1-12 and presents newly added claims 13-16. The new independent claims recite substantially broader and simpler language pertaining to determining a destination for a communication event received in a network. The new depending claims recite language and antecedent basis agreeing with their respective base claims. Applicant believes the newly presented claims 13-16 differentiate from original claims 1-12 to the degree that the double patenting rejection no longer applies.

As the newly presented base claims, and therefore the depending claims are believed to be patentably distinct, applicant respectfully requests that the rejection be withdrawn and that the case be passed quickly to issue.

If any fees are due beyond fees paid with this amendment, authorization is made to deduct those fees from deposit account 50-0534. If any time extension is needed beyond any extension requested with this amendment, such extension is hereby requested.

Respectfully Submitted,  
Igor Neyman et al.

by   
Donald R. Boys  
Reg. No. 35,074

Central Coast Patent Agency  
P.O. Box 187  
Aromas, CA 95004  
(831) 726-1457